UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,237	07/02/2001	Mika Munenaka	09792909-5086	8226
	7590 05/21/200 EIN NATH & ROSEN	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 0610	080	AILES, BENJAMIN A		
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/897,237	MUNENAKA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BENJAMIN AILES	2142		

	BENJAMIN AILES	2142	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	مط لمصمعهم مطاعمة النب	
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beto	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	er form for appear by materially rec	idenig of simplifying th	ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ul><li>4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li><li>5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li></ul>		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8,10-17,19-26</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing an entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( 13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Andrew Caldwell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142			
,			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, are not found persuasive. Applicant argues with respect to independent claims 1, 10 and 19 that the cited prior art, Angles in view of Prust, does not teach the limitation: "wherein said content managing portion counts the period for which each content was stored or linked in each user area and creates a database containing the counted values." The examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasoning set forth in the final rejection. The examiner maintains that Angles specifically teaches the recordation of audit information which includes but is not limited to what content is actually viewed, how often content is viewed, who has actually viewed the content, the number and type of content viewed, etc. This audit information clearly taught by Angles in just column 15, line 67 through column 16, line 7 is deemed within the scope of "counting the period for which each content is stored or linked" when correctly considered in combination with what is taught by Prust. The combination of Angles and Prust as set forth in the above rejection teaches on the content in question being either stored or linked to a storage area specific to an individual user. Prust teaches in column 1, lines 30-37 a method for providing a remote storage area specifically for users in a computer networking environment wherein it would be considered desirable to store files remotely. 32. Therefore, in view of the above, Angles in view of Prust disclose or at least suggest claims 1, 10 and 19 the claims 2-8, 11-17 and 20-26 which depend directly on either independent claims 1, 10 or 19.